

**REMARKS**

Claims 12 and 16-24 are present in this application. Claims 1, 6-11 and 25-32 have been canceled in accordance with the foregoing amendment. All of the claims remaining in the application are directed to a three layer film laminate. The applicant's declaration and comparative data are commensurate in scope with the subject matter.

Record is made of a conference had with the Examiner in charge of the application and the opportunity is taken to thank the Examiner for all of the courtesies extended by her to the applicant's attorney at the aforesaid conference.

As discussed at the conference, claims 1, 6-11, 25 and 29-32 directed to the laminates wherein the case film layer comprises at least two layers have been canceled and the subject matter, particularly the composite laminates, embraced by the remaining claims (claims 12 and 16-24) wherein the cast film layer comprises at least three layers are supported by the specification and declaration which show that these latter products exhibited significant improvement over the comparison products which differed in that the cast film of the comparison product comprises at least three (3) layers in which the layers have a structure wherein the layers are the same (AAA) while in the multiple layer (3) structure of the invention, the structure is comprised of layers of at least two different polymers (ABA).

The specification at pages 9-15 and the declaration clearly establish the criticality of the structure proposed by applicants, for example in producing the desirable properties, i.e., wet peel strength and barrier properties (*see* Table). Thus a quick calculation indicates the following:

	Example 1	Example 2	Example 3
Dry Inner Peel Strength	84%	30%	213%
Wet Inner Peel Strength	84%	Negative	210%

Such results clearly support applicant's position that the invention is not obvious and would not have been foreseen by the skilled in the art.

The rejection of the claims on prior art is not believed sustainable (*supra*) and should be withdrawn. It is noted however that Griesbach's nonwoven film laminate as described in the published application comprises a core layer and at least one skin layer joined to each other. The core layer, not comprised of multi differing layers, contains micropore developing filler. Examples of polymers suitable for the core layer are set out in paragraph 0052 and for the skin layer in paragraph 0053. Morman is relied on by the Examiner as "absent unexpected results" to establish that the polyolefins employed by Griesbach are functionally equivalent to the low density polyethylene polymers of Morman for the desired use of forming a film and can be used interchangeably. First the applicants have submitted data establishing unexpected results and secondly, the combination of references does not recognize the significance of mixed layers in the core and different polymers for the core and film which is basic to applicant's invention.

It is submitted that the claims as now in the case are allowable to the applicants  
and notification to this effect is now respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: March 24, 2008

/evelyn m. sommer/  
Evelyn M. Sommer  
Registration No. 19,603  
Joshua S. Broitman  
Registration No. 38,006  
OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY AND  
BROITMAN, PC  
570 Lexington Avenue, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10022-6894  
Phone: (212) 681-0600

**CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION**

The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted to the Attn.  
Group 1794, Mail Stop: AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450,  
on the date set forth below

March 24, 2008  
Date

/roberto l. gomez/  
Roberto L. Gomez